

Date: Tue, 8 Mar 94 04:30:22 PST
From: Ham-Digital Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-digital@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Digital-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Digital Digest V94 #62
To: Ham-Digital

Ham-Digital Digest Tue, 8 Mar 94 Volume 94 : Issue 62

Today's Topics:

 Anyone have the AX.25 spec?
 Comercial Data Over Radio
 Food For Thought -- The BBS Network
 Help Mac->PK232
 IMPORTANT NOTICE
 megabit per second packet (was "Re: Packet at 1.2 GHz (23cm)?")
 test
 want aresdata pgm info for packet

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Digital-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Digital Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-digital".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 2 Mar 94 20:37:43 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!swrinde!sgiblab!wetware!
spunky.RedBrick.COM!psinntp!psinntp!arrl.org!mtracy@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Anyone have the AX.25 spec?
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Brian Mahaffy (brianm@boi.hp.com) wrote:
: Does anyone have the AX.25 spec they could email me. I have looked
: in several places on the Internet, but could not find it.

The AX.25 specification is available on the ARRL's Automated Email
Information Server (info@arrl.org). To receive this information, send
an email to info@arrl.org with any subject and the following text as the
body of your message:

help
index
send ax25-1.doc
send ax25-2.doc
quit

You will receive a short set of instructions, a list of available information and the ax.25 spec (in two parts). Additional information on the information server will be posted later this week.

73 de Michael Tracy, KC1SX, ARRL Technical Information Services

Date: 7 Mar 94 20:38:50 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Comercial Data Over Radio
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

	Subject:	Time:2:05 PM
OFFICE MEMO	Comercial Data Over Radio	Date:3/7/94
In reply to: need ssb packet radio info from netcomsv!netcomsv!majiq!blair@decwrl.dec.com		

The author wrote "I want to use marine ssb to transfer files between 2 vessels. Each vessel would be equipped with a PC, radio modem, software and SSB transceiver. I am looking for recommendations on how to get this to work. This would be for commercial use..."

The folks who manufacture ham TNC's/modems probably do more business with commercial customers than with hams. So, I'd recommend contacting them directly. Examples are: HAL Communications, P.O. Box 365, Urbana, IL 61801; Kantronics Corp., 1202 E. 23rd St., Lawrence, KS 66046; PacComm, 4413 N. Hesperides St., Tampa, FL 33614; to name a few. If you've got the big bucks there is always Harris, et al, too!

By the way, unless you have a special circumstance (read high S/N, low multipath channel) such as line of sight, I'd stay away from AX.25 on H F. It would be hard to devise a worse protocol for H.F., even if you tried. Look at PacTOR, CLOVER II, etc., in "ham" hardware.

73/Rick W0TN <rick_whiting@atk.com>

P.S. -- I'd prefer to answer by e-mail, but you didn't put name and info in your request for info.

Date: 7 Mar 1994 08:40:53 -0600
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Food For Thought -- The BBS Network
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Here are a few observations on improvements needed to the BBS network. I hope that this generates some discussion of these problems which will lead to solutions.

BBSs have no priority mechanism for distinguishing between bulk mail (bulletins, etc.), normal mail and priority or emergency mail. In an emergency environment these distinctions must be made and the messages queued appropriately. There should be a mechanism to forward priority or emergency mail immediately and to limit the rate of or suspend the forwarding of normal mail and bulk mail. Priority designators should be compatible with or mappable to NTS designators and any other applicable designators; the mapping should be well defined. This capability should be added to the BBS software and should be controllable by remote sysops.

There is a schism between the SMTP (TCP/IP) addressing and the BBS addressing mechanism: neither form is compatible with the other. Additionally, some forms of the BBS addresses look too much like Internet addresses (for example, NA and SA are valid Internet top-level domains). This makes it difficult for systems running both BBS and TCP/IP to handle mail. The creation of an addressing system which is compatible with the Internet (and with OSI?) addressing should be explored; if compatibility is unobtainable the BBS addressing system should at least coexist with little confusion and operational difficulties.

Personal messages (one-to-one) and bulletins (one-to-many) are too intermixed. There should be a separation of these two functions at the protocol and addressing level, even if they are combined at the user interface.

Bulletins are nearly impossible to manage, especially if one tries to organize them in some logical fashion. Standardized names for bulletin groups should be established with allowances for the addition of local and regional groups. MIDs, BIDs, and other IDs need to be clarified and possibly simplified. BIDs should be expanded to be compatible with that used on the Internet so that newsgroups can be gatewayed at multiple points while avoiding duplication of bulletins.

BBS message interchange protocols are poorly documented. (This is being worked on by WORLI and others.)

Jeff, k9ja

+--+

Jeffrey Austen | Tennessee Technological University
jra1854@tntech.edu | Box 5004
(615) 372-3485 | Cookeville Tennessee 38505 U.S.A.

Date: 7 Mar 94 13:40:46 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!atlas.tntech.edu!
jmg@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Help Mac->PK232
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Hi,

would appreciate some help. Trying to help a new ham in town. He just purchased an older PK232 and is interested in Packet. He has a Macintosh computer. Does anyone know of any software out there that is shareware/freeware that is good?

thanks

Jeff, AC4HF

Date: 2 Mar 94 13:20:10 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!library.ucla.edu!
csulb.edu!paris.ics.uci.edu!news.claremont.edu!kaiwan.com!wetware!
spunky.RedBrick.COM!psinntp!psinntp!laidbak!tellab5!jwa@
Subject: IMPORTANT NOTICE
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

3-2-94

CORRECTIONS

In the March 94 issue of QST "Packet Perspective" Stan Horzepa WA1LOU wrote an article about the Hamblaster.

I would like to make this correction

The Address should have been

Jack Albert (WA9FVP)
203 York Pl.
New Lenox, IL
60451

Ph (815)-723-6564

The address in my signature file (below) is my work QTH.

Tellabs Operations Inc. does not manufacture and
is not involved with the research and development
of the Hamblaster.

All inquires should be sent to the address above.

Jack Albert WA9FVP	Fellow Radio Hacker
Tele (708) 378-6201	
Tellabs Operations, Inc.	FAX (708) 378-6721
1000 Remington Blvd.	jwa@tellabs.com
Bolingbrook, IL 60440	

Date: 4 Mar 94 04:42:00 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!library.ucla.edu!news.mic.ucla.edu!MVS.OAC.UCLA.EDU!
OSYSMAS@uchvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: megabit per second packet (was "Re: Packet at 1.2 GHz (23cm)?")
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

What about 97.311 part e?

"The station records must document all SS emission transmissions
and must be retained for a period of 1 year..." This includes a
general description of the data being sent...

Yuck. Makes me want to go part 15 instead...

Date: 7 Mar 94 16:20:21 MDT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!utah-morgan!hellgate.utah.edu!cc.usu.edu!
stevec.cs.usu.edu!bobw@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: test
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Date: 7 Mar 1994 08:54:00 -0800
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!udel!news.sprintlink.net!connected.com!
connected.com!jgates@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: want aresdata pgm info for packet
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Within one of the several help screens for arespack at the very last two lines
you will find the authors of DATA - one is Weo Morner, San Jose, 408 997 3195.
I dont remember if he is visible by doing a function key or shift function key
but certainly is if you read the help files outside of the program with say,
the type command.

John

--

John Gates	Amateur Radio: N7BTI
Edmonds, WA USA	Internet: jgates@hebron.connected.com
206 774-3777	Compuserve: 72106,367

Date: 2 Mar 94 16:44:32 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!pitstop.mcd.mot.com!
mcdphx!schbbs!waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com!user@uchvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

References <jfhCLuKBA.30D@netcom.com>,
<rcrw90-280294102512@waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com>,
<1994Mar1.153612.21625@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: Using packet radio to access an internet account...

In article <1994Mar1.153612.21625@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
(Gary Coffman) wrote:

> In article <rcrw90-280294102512@waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com>
rcrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters) writes:

> Obscenity is in the eye of the beholder as the Supreme Court has repeatedly
> ruled. Thus the "community standards" tests required for something to be
> declared obscene. Simple profanity is no longer illegal in any state.
> Vulgarity is haphazardly regulated in different jurisdictions, but always
> *only in public*. Private communications containing profanity, vulgarity,
> and even obscenity are protected speech as long as both parties to the
> conversation consent. "Obscene" phone calls are really a misnomer. What's
> covered under these statutes is more appropriately called *harassing* phone
> calls where one party is an unwilling participant.

I don't want to do a Westlaw search on this, but in the last round of the pornography hysteria there have been a whole bunch of regulations issued about "indecent" speech. Not tested in court as far as I know, but (IMHO) the really objectionable part is an attempt to extend this to private telephone conversations.

This subject is often debated on soc.motss since these laws are often used to harass homosexuals in various ways. Sorry I don't have any more specific references to cite right now.

> The FCC has ruled that broadcast radio transmissions, including amateur,
> but *not* common carrier, are always considered *public* utterances with
> possible "unwilling" listeners. Thus the prohibitions against utterances
> that are offensive to the listener community are justified. The FCC has
> issued guidance in the form of the "7 deadly words" that must never be
> uttered over the airwaves, and following Supreme Court guidance, the FCC
> has also prohibited speech referring to excretory or sexual practices.
> There are no corresponding limitations on point to point common carrier
> content.

This indeed was the rule until circa 1991.

> Common carrier and
> voluntary private conversations and correspondence fall under the
> area of protected speech. Public utterances and writings fall under
> varying sets of restrictions depending on where, when, and how they
> are made. The FCC's "broadcast" interpretation is the strictest of
> these limits.

Those who would protect our tender ears from such things delight in pointing out that the first amendment is not absolute and that truly "protected speech" only applies to "legitimate" political debate. In practice this often means subjects approved by those in power. For example the "man boy love association" and the harassment they have received for trying to voice their views. (Not that I think they have merit, but they are supposed to have the right to express those views).

I really don't want to get into a Libertarian debate here, I will leave that to those who have a burning interest in such things (see my .sig - I really mean it :-)

--

Phooey on it all - I'm going sailing for a year or two!!!

Date: 2 Mar 94 16:52:53 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!pitstop.mcd.mot.com!mcdphx!

schbbs!waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com!user@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar1.154410.21850@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<2l0qv9\$dhi@hermes.acs.ryerson.ca>, <1994Mar2.074757.26277@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: megabit per second packet (was "Re: Packet at 1.2 GHz (23cm)?")

In article <1994Mar2.074757.26277@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
(Gary Coffman) wrote:

> (1) Only the following sets of connections may be used:
>
> Number of stages Taps used
> in the shift register in feedback
>
> 7 7,1
> 13 13,4,3,1
> 19 19,5,2,1
[...]
> Well, whomp there it is! Clear as mud isn't it?

What the rules don't make clear is that shift registers in various combinations can generate some interesting sequences which don't repeat for a very long time. The ones allowed by the rules are "short sequence" codes which repeat fairly often, thus it is not difficult (comparitively speaking) for the FCC to find and monitor the transmission.

Last time I studied the question (>15 years ago :-), the publically available theory wasn't very helpfull in predicting the lengths of the sequences and their "randomness". Still an interesting area for "tinkering".

--

Phooey on it all - I'm going sailing for a year or two!!!

End of Ham-Digital Digest V94 #62

